

1           Mark J. Young  
2           Fla. Bar No. 0078158  
3           Pro Hac Vice  
4           myoungpa@gmail.com  
5           MARK YOUNG, P.A.  
6           1638 Camden Avenue  
7           Jacksonville, FL 32207  
8           Tel.: 904-996-8099  
9           Attorney for Oceanic Production  
10          Equipment, Ltd. and Jordan Klein Sr.

11          James E. Doroshow (SBN 112,920)  
12          jdoroshow@foxrothschild.com  
13          Ashe Puri (SBN 297,814)  
14          apuri@foxrothschild.com  
15          FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP  
16          10250 Constellation Blvd., Suite  
17          900  
18          Los Angeles, CA 90067  
19          Tel. (310) 598-4150  
20          Attorneys for Defendants  
21          Oppenheimer Cine Rental, LLC,  
22          Oppenheimer Camera Products,  
23          Inc., and Marty Oppenheimer

24          David A. Peck  
25          SBN 171854  
26          COAST LAW GROUP LLP  
27          1140 South Coast Highway 101  
28          Encinitas, California 92024  
1           Tel. 760.942.8505 x108  
2           Fax 760.942.8515  
3           Email dpeck@coastlawgroup.com  
4           Attorneys for Oceanic Production  
5           Equipment, Ltd. and Jordan Klein Sr.

6          David Grober  
7          davidgrober1@gmail.com  
8          578 West Washington Blvd., Suite 866  
9          Marina Del Rey, CA 90292  
10         Tel. (310) 822-1100  
11         Plaintiff, Pro se

12

13

14

15

16

17

18           **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

19           **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

20

21

22          VOICE INTERNATIONAL, INC., a  
23          California corporation; DAVID  
24          GROBER, an individual,

25          Plaintiffs,

26          vs.

27          OPPENHEIMER CINE RENTAL,  
28          LLC, et al.

1           Defendants.

Case No. 2:15-cv-08830-JAK-KS

*The Honorable John A. Kronstadt,  
Courtroom 750*

1           **JOINT STATUS REPORT**

2           **REQUIRED BY COURT ORDER**

3           **DKT. 449**

4           Complaint Filed: November 12, 2015

In an Order [Dkt. 449] dated February 4, 2020, the Court directed the parties to meet and confer and file a joint report by 3:00pm on Thursday, February 6, 2020, in advance of the February 10, 2020 status conference that states (i) the parties' respective and/or collective views regarding the scope of trial in light of the recent orders; (ii) proposed dates for trial in the next four weeks, in view of the orders and Voice's obligation to obtain counsel promptly; and (iii) any open issues that should be addressed prior to trial.

## I. STATUS CONFERENCE ON MONDAY FEBRUARY 10, 2020

In an Order [Dkt. 456] dated January 31, 2020, the Court continued a Status Conference from February 3, 2020 to February 10, 2020 at 1:30 pm.

## **A. Defendants' Statement**

13       Mark Young, counsel for Defendant Oceanic Production Equipment and  
14 Defendant Jordan Klein Sr., will appear telephonically for the status conference, as  
15 approved by the Court's Order [Dkt. 455] dated January 31, 2020.

**B. Plaintiff's Statement.** David Grober will appear in person at the Status Conference.

## II. SETTLEMENT

Efforts to settle the case have through counsel have failed. However, John Dann and David Grober took it upon themselves and commenced multiple conversations on February 5th and through the morning of February 6<sup>th</sup>, and further involved Jordan Klein Sr. to see if they could fashion a settlement. They have an agreement in principle. David Grober has left a message for Marty Oppenheimer late morning of February 6<sup>th</sup>, to engage him in a discussion for a global settlement. As of the writing of this, approximately 2:30 pm, Thursday

1 February 6<sup>th</sup> Mr. Grober has not heard back from Marty Oppenheimer, and looks  
2 forward to having that conversation, and believes that continued direct  
3 participation between the litigants themselves is most likely to produce results.

4

5 **III. TRIAL DATE**

6 The Court's Order [Dkt. 449] directed the parties to propose dates for trial in  
7 the next four weeks.

8

9 **A. Defendants' Statement**

10 In accordance with the Court's Order [Dkt. 449], Defendants propose a trial  
11 date of February 18, 2020, February 25, 2020 or March 3, 2020.

12 Defendants remain agreeable to having Judge Gail J. Standish or Judge  
13 Karen L. Stevenson preside over all additional proceedings in this matter.

14

15 **B. Plaintiff's Statement**

16 With the Court's determination of the Motions in Limine, multiple issues  
17 were resolved that have allowed the litigants to discuss meaningful settlement.  
18 Plaintiffs wish time to continue to the process to hopefully meet fruition. If it does  
19 not with Marty Oppenheimer, but having an agreement in principal with the OPEL  
20 and Klein Sr., Plaintiff Grober would likely request a mediation with the  
21 Magistrate to see if resolution can be achieved.

22

23 **IV. SCOPE AND DURATION OF TRIAL**

24 Plaintiff's *ex parte* application [Dkt. 446, p. 3 of 8, line 11] refers to a five-  
25 day trial. This conflicts with Defendants' understanding that the trial, as  
26 previously set, would have lasted 4 days, and that each side would be limited to a

1 total of 15 hours for opening statements, direct and cross examinations of  
2 witnesses, and closing arguments. [Dkt. 382, p. 5].  
3

4 **A. Defendants' Statement**

5 Defendants respectfully request that the Court reconsider the trial duration  
6 and hourly limits, in view of the simplification of issues for trial. The Court has  
7 now excluded evidence on the doctrine of equivalents [Dkt. 401, p. 1], and  
8 damages [Dkt. 459], and documents produced untimely after discovery [Dkt. 459].  
9 Defendants respectfully request that the Court shorten the trial to a maximum of  
10 two days, and limit each side to a maximum of five (5) hours for opening  
11 statements, examinations of witnesses, and closing arguments. Defendants believe  
12 5 hours is ample time for each side to address the remaining issues of direct literal  
13 infringement, inducement, invalidity, alter ego and willfulness.

14  
15 **B. Plaintiff's Statement**

16 If there is no settlement reached, Plaintiff Grober, as noted in the recent Ex  
17 Parte, Dkt. 446, Plaintiffs would opt for a trial on infringement first.  
18

19 **V. TRIAL COUNSEL**

20 Counsel for Defendants have not changed. Plaintiff David Grober will  
21 appear *pro se*, as he has done throughout this case. As of the date of this report,  
22 Plaintiff Voice International still has no legal representation for this lawsuit.  
23

24 **A. Defendants' Statement**

25 On December 9, 2019, Attorneys Robert Lauson and Lamar Treadwell filed  
26 an "Ex Parte Application to Withdraw as Plaintiff Voice International's Attorneys  
27 of Record." [Dkt. 431]. Each filed a declaration in support of the application to  
28

1 withdraw. [Dkt. 431 at 4-5 (“Lauson Declaration”), Dkt. 443 (“Treadwell  
 2 Declaration”)]. On January 2, 2020, the Court granted the application. [Dkt. 445].  
 3 The Lauson Declaration makes clear that for months prior to December 2019, Mr.  
 4 Grober knew of Mr. Lauson’s retirement, move to Florida, sale of his law practice  
 5 and inability to continue representing Plaintiff Voice International. [Lauson  
 6 Declaration para. 3] Concomitantly, Mr. Grober knew that Lamar Treadwell,  
 7 appearing *pro hac vice*, could not continue his representation without local counsel  
 8 and support staff. [Treadwell Declaration para. 3]. Indeed, on October 2, 2019,  
 9 Lauson filed a notice of unavailability after December 15, 2019. [Dkt. 384].

10 Plaintiffs have known about the withdrawal of Voice International’s  
 11 attorneys since at least October 2, 2019, when Lauson filed a notice of  
 12 unavailability and informed Grober of his retirement plans. [Lauson Declaration  
 13 para. 3] In the January 2<sup>nd</sup> Order, the Court directed Voice International to retain  
 14 new counsel posthaste:

15       Voice International must move expeditiously to identify and  
 16 engage new counsel. If new counsel is promptly identified but  
 17 conditions engagement on a reasonable continuance of the trial date to  
 18 allow time to review the extensive record in this action and to prepare  
 19 for trial, such relief may be granted based on a review of an  
 20 application that sets forth the specific bases for the request. If Voice  
 21 International fails timely to identify and conditionally engage other  
 22 counsel, that could lead to the dismissal of its claims, without  
 23 prejudice to the claims brought by Grober, to the extent that they are  
 24 viable as claims separate from those advanced by Voice International.  
 25 Dkt. 445, p. 2 of 2.

26 More than a month has passed since the Court’s January 2<sup>nd</sup> Order. More  
 27 than four months have passed since Lauson filed a notice of unavailability. Voice  
 28 International has already had more than adequate time to retain new counsel.  
 29 Voice International’s claims should be dismissed with prejudice, leaving for trial  
 30 only those claims of Plaintiff Grober that are viable as claims separate from those  
 31 advanced by Voice International.

1  
2  
**3 B. Plaintiff's Statement**

4 As noted in Dkt. 446, Robert Lauson had stated to the Court on November  
5 18, 2019, and having known for a half year at least that he was retiring to Florida  
6 in December, and having bought a house, would none-the-less be available for trial  
7 in 2020, and would fly in from Florida to do that. It was only in December, on a  
8 day's notice to Mr. Lauson, from the firm he sold his company to, that we could  
9 not participate and thereupon filed his motion to withdraw, approved by the Court  
10 on January 2, 2020. Mr. Grober has been active in meeting with potential counsel,  
11 as well as undertaking the significant task of dealing and cataloging the case  
12 records and exhibits, as well as attending to the ex parte reexam that Mr. Klein  
13 filed and is due shortly.

14  
**15 VI. JURY INSTRUCTIONS AND VERDICT FORM**

16 The parties have filed proposed and disputed jury instructions [349, 350, 407,  
17 408]. The parties have also filed a proposed jury verdict form. [Dkt. 347].

18  
**19 A. Defendants' Statement**

20 In view of the Court's recent rulings, Defendants revised the last set of jury  
21 instructions and the verdict form. Defendants' revisions incorporate the recent  
22 claim constructions and eliminate entries on damages and doctrine of equivalents.  
23 Defendants provided the revised jury instructions and verdict form to Plaintiff  
24 Grober on February 5, 2020.

25  
**26 B. Plaintiff's Statement**

27 Plaintiff Grober, on short notice of this report, settlement talks and the issues

1 noted above, has not reviewed the jury instructions as to be able to comment.

2

3 **VII. EXHIBIT LIST**

4 The parties filed joint exhibit lists on September 16, 2019 [Dkt. 348], and on  
5 October 15, 2019 [Dkt. 397], and on November 7, 2019 [Dkt. 409].

6 By Order [Dkt. 416, p. 1] dated November 18, 2019, the Court directed the  
7 parties to file a notice of disputed exhibits in which they are grouped by common  
8 objections no later than December 16, 2019. The court instructed the parties to file  
9 a stipulation and proposed order no later than December 13, 2019 if additional time  
10 is necessary.

11 On December 13, 2019, counsel for Plaintiff Voice International requested  
12 Defendants' consent to an extension of time until December 19, 2019, to file a  
13 notice of disputed exhibits in which they are grouped by common objections.  
14 Defendants consented. Counsel for Plaintiff Voice International timely filed a  
15 stipulated request for extension [Dkt. 437] on December 13, 2109.

16 After Defendants provided to Plaintiffs their revised notice of disputed  
17 exhibits grouped by common objections, Defendants did not hear back from  
18 Plaintiffs. Rather than risk missing a deadline, Defendants filed a Joint Exhibit  
19 List [Dkt. 440, title of filing corrected as Dkt. 441] without Plaintiffs' signatures or  
20 approval. That Exhibit List [Dkt. 441] contains a list of exhibits and table of  
21 objections exactly as provided by Plaintiffs to Defendants on December 17, 2019.  
22 Defendants edited some of Defendants' objections, but did not add any exhibits.  
23 Defendants did not change any of Plaintiffs' entries in the exhibit list or table of  
24 objections.

25 **A. Defendants' Statement**

26 The Exhibit List [Dkt. 441] filed on December 19, 2019, is the latest version  
27 of the exhibit list. While the exhibit list may include exhibits that Plaintiffs  
intended to offer in support of damages and doctrine of equivalent claims, and

1 exhibits that were not timely produced during discovery, Defendants do not believe  
2 further revisions of the exhibit list are necessary before trial. Defendants will be  
3 prepared to make appropriate evidentiary objections, if necessary, during trial.

4

5 **B. Plaintiff's Statement.**

6 Plaintiff Grober, on short notice of this report, settlement talks and the issues  
7 noted above, has not reviewed the exhibit list and is unable to comment.

8

9 **VIII. MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND**

10 On December 19, 2019, Plaintiffs filed a one-page motion for leave to file an  
11 amended Exhibit List [Dkt. 438]. Plaintiffs did not schedule a hearing on the  
12 motion. Defendants' opposed the motion [Dkt. 450].

13 **A. Defendants' Statement**

14 Defendants' opposed the motion [Dkt. 450] for failure to show good cause  
15 and for untimely introduction of exhibits that were omitted from prior joint exhibit  
16 lists filed on September 16, 2019 [Dkt. 348], and on October 15, 2019 [Dkt. 397],  
17 and on November 7, 2019 [Dkt. 409].

18

19 **B. Plaintiff's Statement**

20 Plaintiff Grober, on short notice of this report, settlement talks and the issues  
21 noted above, has not reviewed this issue.

22

23 **IX. REEXAMINATION**

24 On July 23, 2019, Klein Sr. filed a Request for Ex Parte Reexamination No.  
25 90014342, which challenged the validity of every asserted claim of the '662 patent,  
26 i.e., claims 1, 3, 4, 14, 32, 35 and 38. On September 10, 2019, the US Patent and  
27 Trademark Office granted the Request for Reexamination against every asserted

1 claim. [Dkt. 379-1 pp. 81-109]. On December 16, 2019, in a 135-page Office  
2 Action, the US Patent and Trademark Office rejected every asserted claim of the  
3 '662 patent. A copy of the office action is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

4 **A. Defendants' Statement**

5 **Every asserted claim of the '662 patent is currently rejected by the**  
6 **USPTO.** Each claim is very clearly anticipated by the new prior art. The asserted  
7 claims will not survive the reexamination. A trial is unnecessary.

8 On August 16, 2019, counsel for the parties met as required under LR 16-  
9 2. As required by LR 16-2.9, Mark Young, counsel for Defendants OPEL and  
10 Klein Sr. broached settlement. In addressing settlement, Mr. Young referred to  
11 prior art that was delivered during discovery and forms the basis for the Ex  
12 Parte Reexamination Proceeding that is currently pending at the USPTO. Mr.  
13 Young asked Messrs. Grober and Lauson if they had considered the prior art.  
14 While Mr. Grober claimed that he had reviewed the prior art and determined  
15 that it did not anticipate the asserted claims, he could not identify a single claim  
16 element that is not described in the prior art. Mr. Lauson, counsel for Voice  
17 International, vacillated, first saying that he had not reviewed the prior art, then  
18 saying that he "looked at it" but was not prepared to discuss it. To this day,  
19 Plaintiffs have never identified a single claim element that is recited in the  
20 asserted claims but not described in the prior art, because no such element  
21 exists. Plaintiffs have not responded to the outstanding office action.  
22 [Exhibit1].

23 A stay pending final disposition of the reexamination would avoid an  
24 unnecessary trial. Additionally, because (a) the accused MakoHeads are not in use  
25 and will remain so at least until the '662 patent expires on May 26, 2020, and (b)  
26 damages have been excluded, a stay could not conceivably prejudice Plaintiffs.

Accordingly, Defendants support a stay pending the outcome of the reexamination proceeding.

### **B. Plaintiff's Statement**

Plaintiff Grober, as noted above, has also had to undertake Mr. Klein's ex parte USPTO reexam, further removing time from attending to trial issues and locating counsel.

Plaintiff Grober's statement overall. This report was written by Mr. Grober using the initial report sent to Mr. Grober by Mr. Young, and whom was notified of the settlement discussions and that Mr. Grober's response may come late due to the lengthy settlement talks. Mr. Grober just noticed that Mr. Young has filed.

Hopefully the issues of settlement can be fruitful. With an agreement in principle with OPEL and Mr. Klein, and having reached out to Marty Oppenheimer, maybe a great use of the meeting on Monday February 10, would be to try and settle any remaining issues, even set a meeting with the Magistrate if there are remaining issues.

Mr. Grober apologizes to the Court for this report being slightly over the deadline, but hopes the sincere attempts on the part of Grober, Dann and Klein are seen as worthwhile.

Dated: February 6, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

By: DAVID GROBER

s/David Grober  
Plaintiff, Pro Se

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28